

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed October 29, 2008 (“Action”). Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-16 are currently pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Telephonic Interview

Applicant wishes to thank examiner Batista for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of January 5, 2009.

Specification Objection

The Action objects to the title of the invention indicating that the title is not descriptive. *See Action at p. 2.* This amendment replaces the title with a more descriptive title as set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests that the specification objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson et al. (WO 02/102035 A2), hereafter “Bengtsson”, in view of Findikli et al. (US 20050014531 A1), hereafter “Findikli”. *See Action at p. 2-5.* Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson in view of Findikli further in view of Lin (US 20020102998 A1), hereafter “Lin”. *See Action at p. 5-6.* Claims 6, 7, 13 and 14, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson in view of Findikli, further in view of Zad Issa et al. (US 6,751,313 B2), hereafter “Zad”. *See Action at p. 6-7.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

1. Comments on Claim 1

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection in view of the following remarks.

Applicant notes that Bengtsson and Findikli both relate to accessory devices for mobile communications devices. In more detail Bengtsson aims at solving the problem of allowing accessory devices to use the display, keypad and speaker of the portable communication

apparatus to interact with users (*see*, page 1 lines 30-35 thereof). This is accomplished by adding/removing icons associated with the accessory device to/from the display of the mobile communication apparatus. Fındıklı teaches an accessory interaction handler to communicate data (such as the hardware and software capabilities and characteristics of the mobile phone) to the mobile phone accessory that is useful in determining the appropriate software to transfer from mobile phone accessory to mobile phone (*see*, §[0010] thereof).

Currently amended independent claim 1 includes the features of an apparatus configured to “receive media data forwarded from the mobile telecommunications terminal for processing by the media processing circuitry of the apparatus due to the disabling of the second media processing circuitry of the mobile telecommunications terminal.” Support for this claim amendment may be found at least at page 15, lines 5-10 of the application text as filed.

Currently amended claim 1 therefore aims at optimizing the overall performance of the system comprising the accessory device (denoted by the term “apparatus” in claim 1) and the mobile communications device. The claimed invention optimizes the overall performance by providing an accessory device which may be specifically adapted to the environment it is to be used. At the same time the demands for high-processing capabilities in the mobile communications device may be significantly reduced since the media processing is performed in the accessory device. Put in other words, the accessory device according to the claimed invention instructs the mobile communications device not to perform a function. Instead the accessory device performs this function for the communications device.

Neither Bengtsson nor Fındıklı teaches or render obvious an accessory device performing a disabled function for the mobile communications device. In more detail, Bengtsson at page 9 lines 4-7 discloses an accessory device requesting an icon of the display of the mobile phone to be removed. As is clear from Bengtsson page 7 line 18 to page 9 line 13, the icon to be removed is uploaded from the accessory device in the first place (as the accessory device is connected to the mobile phone). Hence the icons are not associated with media processing functionality of the mobile phone. Contrary, the icons displayed on the mobile phone are associated with the accessory device. Particularly, the icons are not associated with disabling media processing functionality in the mobile phone. Handling icons and disabling media processing functionality do not correspond to the same technical features. Further, Bengtsson fails to disclose the

accessory device being configured to perform a disabled function for the mobile communications device.

Findikli at §[0010] teaches an accessory interaction handler of the mobile phone communicating data to the mobile phone accessory that is useful in determining the appropriate software to transfer from mobile phone accessory to the mobile phone. According to Findikli such data can include, for instance, the hardware and software capabilities and characteristics of mobile phone. Further, Findikli at §[0015] teaches the phone interaction handler of the accessory (see, Fig. 1 thereof) to select the software best suited for a particular mobile phone based on the features and capabilities of the currently connected mobile phone. According to Findikli such features of the mobile phone can include, but are not limited to, the existence of a keyboard on mobile phone, the software currently loaded in mobile phone, or the display characteristics and type of the mobile phone. Hence neither of the cited passages of Finkdikli disclose an accessory device adapted to transfer a message to the mobile communications terminal comprising a command to the mobile communications terminal to disable the specified processing functionality in a second media processing circuitry, the second media processing circuitry located in the mobile telecommunications terminal. Particularly the cited passages do not disclose an accessory device performing a disabled function for the mobile communications device. As such, claim 1 defines over the cited combination, even if proper, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

2. Comments on Claims 3-8 and 10-16

Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1, and are thus allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim in addition to the features they recite.

Independent claims 10 and 15 have been amended to recite features analogous to those added to amended claim 1, and hence are allowable for analogous reasons. Claims 11-4 and 16 respectively depend from claims 10 and 15 and thus are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons in addition to the features they recite.

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the currently presented claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue forthwith. Accordingly, such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 29, 2009

By:Christopher M. Swickhamer/

Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001